

Remarks

Claims 1-24 are currently pending and stand rejected. Applicants assert that the claims are in condition for allowance after final as set forth more fully below. Applicants request that a Notice of Allowability be provided or that the finality of the rejections be withdrawn.

103 Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 9, and 11-22 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramraj (US Pub 2002/0174174) in view of Dasgupta, “A Probe-Based Monitoring Scheme for an Object-Oriented, Distributed Operating System.” Claims 3, 10, and 24 are rejected as being unpatentable over Ramraj in view of Lahr, while claims 7 and 23 are rejected as being unpatentable over Ramraj in view of Vaitheeswaran. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

In relation to the independent claims, the Office Action concedes the Ramraj fails to disclose extract information from the application that defines at least the basic internal structure of the application including at least one object component. However, the Office Action asserts that Dasgupta discloses such recitations in at page 62 in the section 4.3. Applicants respectfully disagree that Dasgupta discloses such.

Section 4.3 of Dasgupta pertains to probing of objects of a component list to find failure data about the objects. Thus, there are two important points here. First, there is a component list which indicates that Dasgupta is not extracting data that defines the basic structure, but instead Dasgupta already has a list available to it that defines the objects to be probed. This section of Dasgupta fails to disclose the claim recitations for this reason.

Additionally, section 4.3 of Dasgupta states that the failure data being determined by the probes includes “faulty” or “inaccessible” or “unreachable” or “dead.” This data does not define the basic structure of the application, but instead, this data just reflects the operating status of objects. Thus, Dasgupta fails to disclose the claim recitations for this reason.

Applicants direct the Examiner’s attention to section 6, Debugging Support, on page 65. Here Dasgupta discloses a debug probe that is sent to an object to cause invocation of an interactive debugging routine that resides in the object in order to “check

the insides of the object.” Applicants assert that this section appears to be more pertinent than section 4.3. However, this section also fails to disclose the claim recitations because, as stated before, the probes are sent on the basis of the component list rather than discovering the basic information. Furthermore, there is no extraction of the information defining the basic structure due to the debugging routine residing in the object itself. Thus, it is the object outputting its information to the probe as opposed to the probe performing an extraction of its information.

Additionally, with respect to claims 1 and 20, these claims are further distinguishable because they recite that a console is doing the extraction. As noted above, the debugging routine of the object itself is outputting the data rather than there being an extraction, and there is no console doing any extraction as recited in claims 1 and 20.

As the independent claims 1, 8, 14, and 20 are allowable, dependent claims 2-7, 9-13, 15-19 and 21-24 depend from allowable base claims and are also allowable for at least the same reasons. Furthermore, with respect to claims 3, 7, 10, 23, and 24, the rejection seems inadequate because the rejection does not address the noted inadequacies of Ramraj as set forth for the independent claims from which these dependents claims depend. Specifically, the extraction of information defining the basic structure carries over to these dependent claims and as such, there must be a reference included in the rejection of these claims that also discloses these recitations.


Conclusion

Applicants assert that the application including claims 1-24 is in condition for allowance after final. Applicants request reconsideration in view of the amendments and remarks above and further request that a Notice of Allowability be provided. Should the Examiner have any questions, please contact the undersigned.

No fees are believed due. However, please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 15, 2005


Jeramie J. Keys
Reg. No. 42,724

Withers & Keys, LLC
P.O. Box 71355
Marietta, Ga 30007-1355
(404) 849.2093